

### ***Remarks***

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-3 and 7-21 are pending in the application, with claims 1 and 11 being the independent claims. Claims 5 and 6 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter found therein. Claim 4 was previously cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 7, and 8 are sought to be amended. Specifically, claim 1 is sought to be amended to include the features of allowable claim 6. Claim 2 is sought to be amended to change unnecessarily limiting language. Claims 7 and 8 are sought to be amended to change their dependencies from cancelled claim 6 to claim 1. In the specification, paragraph [0082] is sought to be amended to correct the spelling of the word "phase." These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. Applicants believe that entry of these amendments after final is appropriate because they place the claims in a better condition for allowance or appeal.

Based on the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

### ***Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

The Final Office Action states on page 2 (section 4) that claims 1, 2, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 7,133,648 B1 to Robinson *et al.* (hereinafter, "Robinson") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,798,784 B2 to Dove *et al.* (hereinafter, "Dove"). Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn based on the following remarks.

Applicants disagree that the combination of Robinson and Dove recite all of the claim features with respect to claim 1. For example, the Final Office Action relies on SERDES 152 and SERDES 154 of Dove to allegedly teach "wherein the transmit channel of each SERDES

lane is phase-locked with a corresponding receive channel of a different SERDES lane..." However, upon review it is clear that SERDES 152 and SERDES 154 are communicating on the same SERDES lane, not different SERDES lanes, as recited in Applicants' claim 1. (*See*, Dove, FIG. 9)

However, without acquiescing to the propriety of the rejections, and solely to expedite prosecution of the present application, independent claim 1 is sought to be amended to include the features of allowable claim 6. Specifically, claim 1 is sought to be amended to recite, for example:

...

wherein the transmit channel is part of a first SERDES lane of a first SERDES core, and the corresponding receive channel is part of a second SERDES lane of a second SERDES core.

Further, redundant language was removed from claim 1 in light of this amendment. Neither Robinson nor Dove teaches or suggests this feature, as was conceded by the Examiner on page 5 (section 10) of the Final Office Action where claim 6 was indicated to be allowable. Applicants reserve the right to prosecute broader claims, in a future application, regardless of the actions taken in the present application.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Robinson in view of Dove for at least the reason provided above. Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and is patentable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is patentable, and further for its own features. Claim 5 is sought to be cancelled, and therefore the rejection of claim 5 is now moot. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 5 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Office Action states on page 4 (section 6) that claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Robinson in view of Dove, and further in view

of U.S. Pat. No. 5,434,719 to Miller *et al.* (hereinafter, "Miller"). Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn based on the following remarks.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and is patentable for at least the reason that claim 1 is patentable, and further for its own features. Miller does not cure the deficiencies of Robinson and Dove. Therefore, based on the discussion herein, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 3 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicants note with appreciation the allowance of claims 11-21 and the allowable subject matter in claims 6-10.

***Further Remarks***

With respect to this Application, Applicants hereby rescind any disclaimer of claim scope made in a parent application or any predecessor or related application. The Examiner is advised that any previous disclaimer of claim scope, if any, and the references that it was made to allegedly avoid, may need to be revisited. Nor should any previous disclaimer of claim scope, if any, in this Application be read back into any predecessor or related application, or future related application.

***Comment on Statement of Reasons for Allowance***

Applicants note the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance presented on pages 6 of the Final Office Action for claims 6-21. Applicants reserve the right to demonstrate that claims 6-21 are allowable over the art made of record for further reasons related to any of their recited features. Applicants further contend that reservation of this

right does not give rise to any implication regarding whether the Applicants agree with or acquiesce in the reasoning provided by the Examiner in the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance.


### ***Conclusion***

The stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Jeffrey T. Helvey  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 44,757

Date: 4/23/09

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600  
939040\_1.DOC